



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : Confirmation No. 4407
Seiji KAWASAKI et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2003_1470A
Serial No. 10/684,407 : Group Art Unit 3636
Filed October 15, 2003 : Examiner S. Vu

SEAT STRUCTURE

RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Sir:

The Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on November 29, 2005 indicates that the Brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal and, as such, requires a corrected Appeal Brief.

However, contrary to this assertion in the Notification, the Appeal Brief filed September 7, 2005 does in fact include a separate heading for each ground of rejection, as well as an argument under each separate heading.

In this regard, Examiner Vu was contacted by telephone on December 6, 2005, and the headings and the corresponding arguments were pointed out to the Examiner. The Examiner agreed that the Appeal Brief does properly present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on Appeal, and the Examiner requested that a response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief be filed and refer to the telephone conversation.

More specifically, the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on Appeal are identified on page 8 of the Appeal Brief. The first ground of rejection is identified in a heading A at the top of

page 9 of the Appeal Brief, and a corresponding argument is presented immediately below the heading A and proceeds from page 9 through page 11.

Similarly, the second ground of rejection is identified by a heading B at the top of page 12 of the Appeal Brief, and a corresponding argument is presented immediately therebelow and proceeds through page 14 of the Appeal Brief.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief is improper and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Seiji KAWASAKI et al.

By: Charles R. Watts

Charles R. Watts
Registration No. 33,142
Attorney for Applicants

CRW/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 15, 2005